

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 2—9, 11—16, 19—21, 23, 24, 28—30, 32 and 33 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 1, 10, 17, 18, 22, 25—27 and 31 are currently amended.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1—31 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for reciting “sub-pixel” in the absence of a defined and/or recited “pixel.” In response, the Applicant has amended a number of claims in an effort to make the claims definite without change their scope. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the Claims are now definite and in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner has concerns, the Applicant requests a telephone call, during which the outstanding issues may be resolved.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a plurality of pixels, wherein each pixel comprises a plurality of sub-pixels. Accordingly, the hierarchy of pixel and sub-pixel is recited, which is generally consistent with the Applicant’s Fig. 9 and associated discussion at [0046] to [0048].

Claim 10 has been similarly amended to recite that the screen comprises a plurality of pixels, each comprising a plurality of sub-pixels. This amendment clarifies the relationship between pixels and sub-pixels.

Claim 17 has been amended to clarify that the screen actually receives the ambient light, which is implied by the fact that such light was absorbed by the

screen in the next method step. Additionally, Claim 17 has been amended to recite that "elements" are defined on the screen, rather than sub-pixels. Claim 18 clarifies that the elements can define sub-pixels, a plurality of which defines a pixel.

Claim 22 has been amended to recite "regions" rather than sub-pixels. This clarifies the claim, in part because confusion over lack of a recitation of a pixel is eliminated.

Claim 31 has been similarly amended.

A number of dependent claims have been amended to resolve antecedent basis issues regarding the newly applied terminology.

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Examiner objects to any of the claim amendments, and/or feels that outstanding issues remain, the Applicant asks that the Examiner call, so that the issues may be resolved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 05 June 2007

By:



David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25